

Stewart, Cynthia

**From:** Killinger, Kathryn  
**Sent:** Monday, January 14, 2002 1:32 PM  
**To:** Stewart, Cynthia  
**Subject:** FW: wildlife screen

1) C. Killinger  
Kira... 1/16/02  
Colman  
2) Delwamish (WTF)

**From:** Kathy Godtfredsen[SMTP:kathyg@windwardenv.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 11, 2002 4:29 PM  
**To:** Tad Deshler; Skip Fox; Rick Bodishbaugh; Mike Johns; Michael J Gleason; Martha Burke; Lawrence McCrone; Judith Noble; Jennie Goldberg; Jeff Stern; Gene Revelas; Gary Pascoe; Doug Hotchkiss; Deb Lester; Betsy Stripin; Kathryn Killinger  
**Cc:** Berit Bergquist  
**Subject:** wildlife screen



Other COCs.doc

Attached is Berit's draft screen for wildlife (eagle, heron and PCBs, DDT, and Hg) in response to Erika's concerns at Tuesday's meeting. Note that this memo will evolve into the back-of-the-envelope screen for Erika's eyes to help her feel more comfortable with the results of the King County Wildlife Risk Assessment. This text was not written for inclusion in the problem formulation. If Erika feels comfortable with this very conservative screen, she will not push the rest of her concerns with the wildlife appendix, which will save us quite a bit of work. If she is not comfortable, then our talks will continue and ultimately she may request some of these ROC/COC pairs to carry forth into the EEA.

Note that the attached analysis is very conservative (worst case scenarios). It uses the lowest TRV and the highest potential exposure (max concentration in sediment and fish (regardless of fish type), 100% site usage).

In summary, DDT is clearly not an issue. For PCBs and mercury, predicted doses are less than the respective LOAELs ( $HQ < 1$ ), but unfortunately NOAELs are not available. If the LOAELs are divided by 10, which is a relatively common crutch, then HQs are greater than 1 for heron/mercury ( $HQ = 3.3$ ), heron/PCBs ( $HQ = 4.4$ ), eagle/mercury ( $HQ = 1.5$ ), and eagle/PCBs ( $HQ = 20$ ).

Because some of the assumptions are highly unlikely (e.g., heron feeding on adult English sole, 100% ingestion of most contaminated sediment), we should consider taking this assessment one step further in the discussion section before passing it along. But first, I wanted you all to see the most conservative assessment version possible, because if an issue can be resolved in this way (i.e., the slam dunk), then further refinements are unwarranted.

Please give this analysis a review, and let's chat about it soon. Thanks -  
Kathy